



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,916	12/11/2003	A. James Schutz	LLJ-10102/08	8483

25006 7590 02/07/2005

GIFFORD, KRASS, GROH, SPRINKLE & CITKOWSKI, P.C
PO BOX 7021
TROY, MI 48007-7021

EXAMINER

TORRES, ALICIA M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3671

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

JE

<p><i>Office Action Summary</i></p>	Application No. 10/733,916	Applicant(s) SCHUTZ, A. JAMES	
	Examiner Alicia M Torres	Art Unit 3671	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 1, 2, 4-7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tally in view of Bott.

3. In regards to claims 1, 2 and 4-7, Tally discloses an apparatus operative for gathering yard refuse from a ground surface, said apparatus comprising:

a gathering device having a frame (10, 16) and a motor (mounted at 24), said frame (10, 16) supporting an elongated rotor (not shown, 22) having a longitudinal axis, said elongated rotor (22) being disposed with a row of spaced apart tines (at 22) extending perpendicular to the longitudinal axis, said elongated rotor driven (22) by said motor (24), said tines (at 22) operative to gather yard refuse from the ground surface when rotating and being moved over the ground surface;

a wheel (20) operative to support said frame (10, 16) on the ground surface;

an adjustment mechanism (58, 64) operatively mounted to the wheel (20) adjacent said elongated rotor (22) to adjust the position of the elongated rotor (22) with respect to the ground surface; and

Art Unit: 3671

a basket (30) for holding the yard refuse collected from the ground surface pivotally attached to the gathering device (10, 16), said basket (30) having a top and a bottom, said basket (30) having at least one wheel (32) supporting said basket (30) on the ground surface; and

at least one link member (hooks, not shown, see column 2, lines 25-26) said at least one link member having one end pivotally mounted to said basket (30) and an opposite end pivotally mounted to said frame (10, 16), said at least one link member permitting the basket (30) to be lifted upwardly to empty the basket (30), as per claim 1; and

wherein the gathering device further comprises a shield (10) for preventing the collected yard refuse from being ejected out from the gathering device, as per claim 2; and

wherein the basket (30) is a hinged basket (30) adapted to be selectably attachable to the gathering device, as per claim 4; and

wherein the tines (at 22) have a diameter of $\frac{1}{2}$ -1 $\frac{1}{2}$ inches and a length of 5-9 inches, as per claim 5; and

wherein the device is further operative for thatching a lawn, as per claim 6; and

Wherein the elongated rotor (22) appears to be 36-108 inches in length, as per claim 7.

However, Tally fails to disclose wherein the wheel is a pair of wheels operatively connected to the frame, as per claim 1; and

Wherein the basket is supported by a second pair of wheels, as per claim 4.

Bott discloses a similar rake wherein the wheels (79) are a pair of wheels operatively connected to the frame (9) adjacent opposing ends of the elongated rotor (37), as per claim 1.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the wheels of Bott on the device of Tally in order to vary the

Art Unit: 3671

height of the tines over the ground. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a second pair of wheels on the basket, as per claim 4, since it has been held that mere duplication of parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art.

4. In regards to claims 9, 10 and 12, Tally discloses an apparatus adapted to be towed by a vehicle and operative for gathering yard refuse from a ground surface, said apparatus comprising:

- a gathering device having a frame (10, 16) that supports an elongated rotor (not shown, 22) and a motor (at 24) in communication with said elongated rotor (22), said elongated rotor (22) having a row of spaced apart tines (also at 22) and mounted to said frame (10, 16) to be rotatably driven by said motor (24), said tines (22) operative to gather yard refuse from the ground surface when rotating and being towed over the ground surface;

- a wheel (20) operative to support said frame (10, 16) on the ground surface;

- an adjustment mechanism (58, 64) operatively mounted to said wheel (20) adjacent said elongated rotor (22) to adjust the position of the elongated rotor (22) with respect to the ground surface; and

- a basket (30) for holding the yard refuse collected from the ground surface pivotally attached to the gathering device, as per claim 9; and

- wherein the gathering device further comprises a shield (10) for preventing the collected yard refuse from being ejected out from the gathering device, as per claim 10; and

- wherein the basket (30) is a hinged basket (30) adapted to be selectably attachable to the gathering device, as per claim 12.

Art Unit: 3671

However, Tally fails to disclose wherein the wheel is a pair of wheels operatively connected to the frame, as per claim 9; and

Wherein the basket is supported by a second pair of wheels, as per claim 12.

Bott discloses a similar rake wherein the wheels (79) are a pair of wheels operatively connected to the frame (9) adjacent opposing ends of the elongated rotor (37), as per claim 9.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the wheels of Bott on the device of Tally in order to vary the height of the tines over the ground. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a second pair of wheels on the basket, as per claim 12, since it has been held that mere duplication of parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art.

5. In regards to claims 14, 15, 17-19, Tally discloses an apparatus adapted to be towed by a vehicle and operative for gathering sticks from a ground surface, said apparatus comprising:

a gathering device having a frame (10, 16) that supports an elongated rotor (not shown, 22) and a motor (at 24) in communication with said elongated rotor (22), said elongated rotor (22) having a row of spaced apart tines (also at 22) and operative to be rotatably driven by said motor (24), said tines (22) operative to gather sticks from the ground surface when rotating and being towed over the ground surface;

a wheel (20) operative to support said frame (10, 16) on the ground surface;

an adjustment mechanism (58, 64) operatively mounted to said wheel (20) adjacent said elongated rotor (22) to adjust the position of the elongated rotor (22) with respect to the ground surface; and

Art Unit: 3671

a basket (30) for holding the sticks collected from the ground surface pivotally attached to the gathering device, as per claim 14; and

wherein the gathering device further comprises a shield (10) for preventing the collected sticks from being ejected out from the gathering device, as per claim 15; and

wherein the basket (30) is a hinged basket (30) adapted to be selectably attachable to the gathering device, as per claim 17; and

wherein the tines (at 22) have a diameter of $\frac{1}{2}$ - $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches and a length of 5-9 inches, as per claim 18; and

wherein the gathering device is further operative for thatching a lawn, as per claim 19.

However, Tally fails to disclose wherein the wheel is a pair of wheels operatively connected to the frame, as per claim 14; and

Wherein the basket is supported by a second pair of wheels, as per claim 17.

Bott discloses a similar rake wherein the wheels (79) are a pair of wheels operatively connected to the frame (9) adjacent opposing ends of the elongated rotor (37), as per claim 14.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the wheels of Bott on the device of Tally in order to vary the height of the tines over the ground. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a second pair of wheels on the basket, as per claim 17, since it has been held that mere duplication of parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art.

Art Unit: 3671

6. Claims 3, 11 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tally in view of Bott as applied to claims 1, 9 and 14 above, and further in view of Jobling et al., hereafter Jobling.

The device is disclosed as applied above. However, Tally and Bott fail to disclose wherein the tines include distal ends that are bent outwardly toward a direction of rotation of the elongated rotor.

Jobling discloses a similar rake wherein the tines (58) include distal ends that are bent outwardly (57) toward a direction of rotation of the elongated rotor (52).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the outwardly bent ends of the tines of Jobling on the tines of Tally and Bott in order to afford a more effective removal of material from the turf.

7. Claims 8, 13 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tally in view of Bott as applied to claims 1, 9 and 14 above, and further in view of Doering et al., hereafter Doering.

The device is disclosed as applied above. However, the combination fails to disclose wherein the elongated rotor is selectably attachable to the gathering device.

Doering discloses a similar rake wherein the elongated rotor is selectably attachable to the gathering device (see column 2, lines 59-62).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the selectably attachable rotor of Doering on the device of Tally and Bott in order to afford tool interchangeability.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia M. Torres whose telephone number is 703-305-6953. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 7:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas B. Will, can be reached at 703-308-3870.

Art Unit: 3671

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-1113. The fax number for this Group is 703-872-9306.



Thomas B. Will
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 3671

AMT
January 31, 2005